DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 724 EA 021 080

AUTHOR Melnick, Steven A.
TITLE Cooperating Teachers: What Do They See in the Classroom?
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Observation Techniques; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Lesson Observation Criteria; *Practicum Supervision; *Student Teacher Evaluation; Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Student Teaching

ABSTRACT

A study sought to determine the extent to which cooperating teachers' narrative comments on weekly observations reflect six categories of beginning teachers' competencies and to ascertain the relationships among cooperating teachers' narrative comments, their midterm evaluations of student teachers, and their final evaluation of student teachers. The sample consisted of 25 cooperating teachers primarily in grades K-8. Cooperating teachers were asked to focus their evaluations on a set of 30 teacher competency statements. Both qualitative and quantitative data were used in the analyses. Findings cited significant differences between midterm and final numerical ratings, although cooperating teachers did not focus on these ratings in their weekly narrative evaluations. In addition, cooperating teachers' narrative comments lacked specificity and tended to provide only positive feedback. The results suggest that in the absence of well-documented observations of student teachers, cooperating teachers find it difficult to discern student teachers' professional growth. If student teachers are to significantly improve during their practicum experience, it is essential to provide adequate training of cooperative teachers. Appended are the list of teaching competencies and student teaching evaluation forms. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307724

Cooperating Teachers: What Do They See In The Classroom?

Steven A. Melnick

The Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg
The Capital College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Steven A. Melnick
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California
March 31, 1989

EA 021 080

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

Abstract

The purpose of this study was (a) to determine the extent to which cooperating teachers' narrative comments on weekly observations reflect six categories of beginning teacher competencies and (b) to determine if there are any relationships among cooperating teachers' narrative comments, their mid-term evaluations of student teachers, and their final evaluations of student teachers. The sample consisted of 25 cooperating teachers primarily in grades K-8. Cooperating teachers were asked to focus their evaluations on a set of 30 teacher competency statements. Both qualtitative and quantitative data were used in the analyses.

It was found that while some significant differences were found between mid-term and final numerical ratings, teachers did not focus on these areas in their weekly narrative evaluations. Cooperating teacher narrative comments lacked specificity and tended to provide only positive feedback.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the contribution of Kaye Lantz who assisted in the initial coding of the cooperating teacher narratives and provided her insights into the interpretation of the qualitative data. In addition, I would like to thank Bill Henk for taking the time to read and critique earlier drafts of this paper.

Cooperating Teachers: What Do They See in the Classroom?

By the end of the student teaching semester, the overwhelming majority of student teachers are rated very high by their cooperating teachers on formal evaluation instruments. This lack of any substantial variation in evaluation may indicate that cooperating teachers are in need of additional training in supervision. In order to determine what eventual training needs are, it is necessary to first determine how cooperating teachers currently view their student teachers' teaching. The objectives of this study are (a) to determine the extent to which cooperating teachers' narrative comments on weekly observations reflect six categories of beginning teacher competencies and (b) to determine if there are any relationships among cooperating teachers' narrative comments, their mid-term evaluations of student teachers, and their final evaluations of student teachers.

Theoretical Framework

Glickman (1985) describes observation as a two-part process. Part I of observation is describing what has been seen; part II is interpreting what it means. Cooperating teacher observations (i.e., what was described) were focused upon a set of 30

beginning teacher competencies adapted from a validation study by Streifer (1984). Streifer's study resulted in 85 competency statements which were rated by 1,733 classroom teachers as to the extent to which they were important indicators of beginning teacher effectiveness and whether they were directly observable in the classroom. In a later study, Streifer and Iwanicki (1987) logically grouped those 85 items into the following five categories: (a) planning, (b) instruction, (c) student evaluation, (d) professional knowledge, and (e) professional responsibilities. The 30 competency statements used in this study were judged by a panel of 6 professors of education to be representative of the five categories listed above. Although the competencies reflected the five general categories above, they were subdivided into six specific categories for the purpose of organizing the observation instrument: (a) Planning, (b) Instruction, (c) Professional Knowledge, (d) Classroom Management, (e) Personal Attributes, and (f) Professional Responsibility.

Methods

Sample

The sample utilized in this study consisted of all cooperating teachers for the Fall semester 1987 (n=25). Table 1 describes the sample by sex and grade level. There were 11 male and 14 female cooperating teachers. All grade levels were

represented from Kindergarten through grade 6 plus grade 8 and one senior high school social studies teacher.

Data Collection

Cooperating teachers were asked to write weekly narratives describing student teachers' strengths and weaknesses with respect to the six categories listed above. Each observation form contained a list of competency statements grouped by category to help the cooperating teacher focus the observation narratives (see Appendix A). For the 12-week student teaching experience, narrative observation comments were collected weekly from each cooperating teacher (n=25). All narratives written during weeks 2, 4, 8, and 10 were selected for analysis. During weeks 6 and 12, numerical ratings on each competency were collected using a Likert 5-point scale (1=poor; 5=outstanding). Appendix B contains an example of the instrument used.

Qualitative analysis

The bi-weekly narrative data was typed verbatim into a word processing program and later transferred to a microcomputer program designed to assist in the analysis of qualitative data. The entire text of the narratives was printed out and coded to reflect the nature of cooperating teacher comments with respect to the 30 competency statements. Based upon the coding scheme, the data were sorted and analyzed to determine what patterns

existed in cooperating teachers' narratives relative to the 30 competency statements comprising six categories.

Quantitative analyses

Cooperating teachers rated their student teacher's performance at mid-term and end-of-term on 30 specific teaching competencies that are related to the six categories. Cooperating teachers were asked to rate their student teachers' performance on each competency statement using a 5-point Likert scale (1=poor, 5=outstanding). Mean scores on each of the six categories for both the mid-term and final evaluations were computed by averaging the total score for all items in that category (e.g., Planning mean = mean of items 1 to 4). Six correlated t-tests were used to determine if there were any significant differences ($p<.05$) between the mid-term and final evaluations with respect to the six categories. In addition, 30 correlated t-tests were calculated to determine which individual competencies were significantly different between mid-term and final evaluations.

Results

Qualitative Analyses

Table 1 shows the percentage of teachers who addressed each competency category. The category of Personal Attributes (76%) was the most frequently addressed area. Instruction, Classroom

Management (72%), Planning (64%), Professional Responsibilities (56%) were the next most frequently addressed areas. Professional Knowledge (16%) was the least frequently mentioned area by the cooperating teachers.

Table 2 shows the rank order of the total number of competencies addressed by cooperating teachers, the percentage of all competencies represented, and the number of cooperating teachers at each level. The table shows that one cooperating teacher discussed 47% of all competencies in the weekly narratives. All of the other cooperating teachers addressed far fewer categories in their narratives. In fact, only four teachers addressed more than 25% of the competencies. All of the other twenty-one cooperating teachers addressed fewer than 25% of the competencies. The majority of the cooperating teachers discussed between 7% and 23% of the teaching competencies in their narratives.

The following sections summarize cooperating teachers' written comments relative to these six areas.

Planning. The area of planning addressed four issues: (a) establishing clear objectives, (b) establishing appropriate objectives for the learner, (c) preparing lesson plans that are clear, and (d) preparing lesson plans that are complete. Approximately 64% of the cooperating teachers addressed at least one of these areas in their written comments.

Cooperating teachers' written comments were very positive

relative to establishing clear objectives. However, very brief comments such as "sound planning", "good planning," etc. were all that was offered. Of the eight comments that deal with the establishing of objectives appropriate for the learners, only one dealt directly with the issue. Most of the comments generalized about related issues: "Lessons have been well prepared," and "She demonstrated great leadership . . . ." Fifty-two percent of the cooperating teachers responded to the issue of preparing lesson plans that are complete. All but two commented positively with such remarks as "planning is still a strong point," "well organized," "pace was good." Only two cooperating teachers commented on preparing lesson plans that are appropriate for the objectives. Of these, only one commented directly on the issue. Those cooperating teachers that did comment on the area of planning were overwhelmingly positive. Only two of the 32 comments written in this category by 16 cooperating teachers were negative.

Instruction. The area of instruction addressed 9 issues: (a) makes the objectives of the lesson clear to students, (b) presents lessons that involve a variety of methods, materials, advancing technology, and human resources, (c) provides clear directions and explanations when teaching, (d) paces instructional activities appropriately, (e) ties together planned and chance events of the lesson and relates them to the objectives, (f) keeps students' attention, (g) evaluates

learners' progress appropriately, (h) uses standard English in oral presentations, and (i) uses standard English in written presentations.

Cooperating teachers' written comments were mostly positive relative to making the objectives of the lesson clear to the students: "her objectives are clear not only in the plans but also in her teaching," "[student] has maintained his strengths ... such as stating objectives before lessons." It would appear that the student teachers' competency in this area was satisfactory to the cooperating teachers; however, because only four (16%) of the cooperating teachers responded, this conclusion must remain tentative.

Relative to the issue of presenting lessons that involve a variety of methods, materials, advanced technology, and human resources, the six cooperating teachers who commented (24%) were enthusiastic about the student teachers' competency in this area: "use of audio-visual materials has been excellent," "very creative," "she has used her talent in drawing to enhance many lessons." In addition to general descriptions, most of the comments detailed several examples of student teachers' use of methods, materials, etc.

Of the four cooperating teachers (16%) who responded to the issue of providing clear directions and explanations when teaching, three were generally positive about student teachers' abilities: "directions are clear," "key words in his lessons

have been discussed in a detailed and deliberate manner." One cooperating teacher commented on the student teacher's lack of clear explanations and instructions. Although the cooperating teachers offered both positive and negative feedback, only 16% addressed this area.

Addressing the issue of pacing instructional activities appropriately, 12 cooperating teachers responded, most of them favorably. Most of the comments, whether positive or negative, were very general, although a few elaborated with specific examples: "pacing is good," "moved from test to lesson smoothly," "extended lessons when the class enthusiasm paved the way to do so." On one hand, there was a significant response (48%) to this issue; on the other hand, the responses lacked specificity.

Six cooperating teachers commented relative to keeping students' attention. All comments included descriptions of or suggestions to improve student teachers' ability to hold the learners' attention. Although the responses were fairly detailed, only 6 of the 25 cooperating teachers (24%) commented on this issue.

Only one comment was offered for each of the other competencies in this category: ties together planned and chance events of the lesson and relates them to the objectives, evaluates learners' progress appropriately, uses standard English in oral presentations, and uses standard English in written

presentations.

Professional knowledge. The area of professional knowledge addressed four issues: demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter taught including (a) its major principles and concepts, (b) its purpose and value, (c) up-to-date factual information, and (d) demonstrates knowledge of various teaching styles and learning styles and understands their interrelationships.

This area was essentially ignored by all cooperating teachers. Only four cooperating teachers (16%) wrote some comment about this area. In two cases, the cooperating teachers detailed specific instances in class where the student teacher imparted incorrect information to the students. In the other two instances, the cooperating teacher was praising specific content knowledge. In general, this area was mostly ignored by the cooperating teachers.

Classroom management. The area of classroom management addressed four specific issues: (a) provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly, (b) establishes and maintains classroom routines and procedures, (c) handles discipline problems fairly and consistently, (d) develops and maintains a system for keeping group and individual records. Seventy-two percent of the cooperating teachers addressed issues in this category.

Of the ten cooperating teachers' comments (33%) that dealt with establishing and maintaining classroom routines and

procedures, all but one were positive: "has shown good organizational skills," "have confidence in both his instruction and his classroom management techniques." Most of the comments generalized about student teachers' classroom management competency--few offered any concrete information.

Cooperating teachers offered positive comments such as "classroom management is coming along... it's not an easy job, but she's making improvements" and "discipline for the reading class is good... However, the noise and talking during other classes must be monitored more closely." The few comments that were offered in this area tended to be very general and offered few specifics.

Two cooperating teachers (8%) commented relative to developing and maintaining a system for keeping group and individual records. The comments expressed general approval of student teachers' record-keeping abilities but did not support with details or examples.

Personal attributes. The area of personal attributes addressed three issues: (a) demonstrates enthusiasm and self-confidence in the classroom, (b) demonstrates sensitivity and respect concerning the needs and feelings of students, and (c) communicates effectively with students. This area was addressed most by cooperating teachers. Seventy-six percent of the cooperating teachers addressed this area.

Of the 12 cooperating teachers who commented about

demonstrating enthusiasm and self-confidence in the classroom, the vast majority wrote positive remarks. Most comments consisted of generalized praise in a "pep-talk" format: "great attitude," "your confidence and enthusiasm continue to show growth," "keep gaining confidence in your abilities." The response to this issue was greater than that of any other issue and was overwhelmingly positive.

All ten of the comments (40%) that related to demonstrating sensitivity and respect concerning the needs and feelings of students were approving but vague. The cooperating teachers affirmed that student teachers were indeed sensitive and respectful toward learners, but did not offer much substantive commentary to back it up: "good rapport with students," "very good at seeing and working with individual needs," "relates well to the students." No negative comments were offered.

Relative to communicating effectively with students, cooperating teachers' comments were mostly positive, though general: "able to interact with students," "has established a good rapport with the class." Six cooperating teachers (24%) commented on this issue.

Professional responsibility. The area of professional responsibility addressed six issues: (a) follows the policies, procedures, and curricula of the school district, (b) works cooperatively with colleagues, (c) works cooperatively with administrators, (d) works cooperatively with parents, (e)

demonstrates responsibility for self-growth and professional improvement, and (f) demonstrates responsibility for self-evaluation.

Fourteen of the 25 cooperating teachers (56%) addressed this area. None of the cooperating teachers made any comment about following the policies, procedures, and curricula of the school district.

Eight cooperating teachers (32%) commented on whether their student teachers worked cooperatively with colleagues. All 8 praised the student teachers, many citing specific instances of cooperation and helpfulness: "willing to help and participate in all areas," "I have appreciated the open channel that exists between [student teacher] and me." Although only eight of the cooperating teachers responded, those who did tended to respond fully and enthusiastically.

None of the cooperating teachers addressed the extent to which student teachers worked cooperatively with administrators. In all likelihood, student teachers had little contact with district administrators.

Only one cooperating teacher commented on the student teacher's relationship with parents. It was noted that "[student] did very well on parent conference day and provided many positive comments about students and their work."

The four cooperating teachers (16%) who commented relative to demonstrating responsibility for self-growth and professional

improvement focused on the manner in which student teachers accepted and used criticism: "willingness to incorporate suggestions in lessons," "works hard on criticisms and suggestions that are given to him."

Four cooperating teachers (16%) commented on student teachers' demonstration of responsibility for self-evaluation. All four responded positively to this item: "[he] is deeply concerned about improving his teaching skills," "does not hesitate to 'reteach' concepts which might have caused problems for students." The comments were very general with little concrete information to support them.

Summary. Sixty-four percent of the cooperating teachers commented on the area of planning. Comments were most frequently (72%) relative to preparing lesson plans that are complete. The next most frequently mentioned item (32%) was establishing objectives appropriate for the learners. Although these two items drew a significant response, all but a few comments failed to deal directly with the specific issue. Instead they generalized about planning as a whole rather than commenting on any specific competency. Cooperating teachers did not offer substantive feedback or offer specific suggestions for improvement.

Seventy-two percent of the cooperating teachers addressed the area of instruction. The issue of appropriate pacing of instructional activities received the most commentary (48%);

however, most of the comments lacked substantive content. Comments in this area tended to be of the "pat-on-the-back" variety, affirming a job well-done. Cooperating teachers did not offer concrete descriptions of the student teachers' competency, nor did they offer any specific suggestions for improvement. Three of the nind items in this area received only one comment each (tying together planned and chance events of the lesson, use of standard English in written and oral presentations).

Of the four competencies in the area of professional knowledge, only three of them were addressed at all. Only four cooperating teachers (16%) commented in this area, thus giving this area the lowest response of all six competency areas.

The area of classroom management received a moderate rate of commentary. Judging from the response rates, it would appear that cooperating teachers felt that the ability to handle discipline problems (48%) was a more critical competency for student teachers than record-keeping abilities (8%). Discipline problems may have been more pervasive during the student teachers' stay and students probably had more difficulty with discipline than they did with the other three competencies.

The three competencies listed for the area of personal attributes received the greatest response of the six competency areas. Two reasons for such a high response may be (1) that cooperating teachers believe personal attributes to be the most important component of teaching or (2) that cooperating teachers

found it easier to comment on the student teachers' enthusiasm, self-confidence, sensitivity, etc., than on their instructional skills and professional knowledge.

Three of the four items in the area of professional responsibility received a 16% response or less. One item (works cooperatively with colleagues) was commented on by 32% of the cooperating teachers. This greater response may be due to the naturally greater contact the student teachers had with the cooperating teachers compared to administrators and parents.

Quantitative Analyses

Table 4 compares the mean numerical rating for the mid-term evaluation with the mean numerical rating on the final evaluation for each of the six scales. As can be seen in column four, there was a significant difference ($p<.05$) between mid-term and final ratings of student teachers in the area of Planning. In examining the means in all categories, it is evident that cooperating teachers perceive growth to have occurred. However, no significant differences were found between mid-term and final ratings of student teachers in the areas of Instruction, Professional Knowledge, Classroom Management, Personal Attributes, or Professional Responsibility.

Table 5 compares the item means for mid-term and final evaluations. Out of 30 items, only six were significantly different (Items 2, 4, 8, 17, 20 and 24). In addition, Table 5

contains the number of times that each item was mentioned in cooperating teacher narratives and the number of cooperating teachers who mentioned it.

It is interesting to note that items 2, 4, 17, and 24 received relatively little discussion in cooperating teachers' narratives yet the mid-term and final ratings were significicantly different. Items 8 and 20 received a fair amount of discussion by cooperating teachers. In reviewing all other items, it was found that items 19, 22, and 26 received a fairly large amount of discussion by cooperating teachers yet the mid-term and final ratings were not significantly different.

Discussion

It is interesting to note that the areas receiving the most attention in the narrative comments are not significantly different in the numerical ratings. There is an inconsistency that is difficult to explain based on these data. One could accurately speculate that there are far more interactions between cooperating teacher and student teacher than these analyses identify. However, there appears to be a reluctance on the cooperating teachers' part to offer negative feedback. The overwhelming tendency, as evidenced by the narrative comments, is to offer only positive feedback. Cooperating teachers do not seem to focus on the areas in need of improvement in their narratives. The question then arises as to whether or not the

negative feedback is offered to the student in other ways. For example, does the cooperating teacher conference with the student teacher or is the university supervisor asked to pass on the information?

It may be an uncomfortable situation to point out an individual's weaknesses in a face-to-face conference. For this reason, cooperating teachers seem to be more apt to focus on positive reinforcement and avoid the potentially uncomfortable situation of discussing one's weaknesses in the narrative comments. Further research is indicated to determine the manner in which cooperating teachers help student teachers to identify areas for improvement.

Another concern is that the narratives revealed that cooperating teachers in this study comment most frequently about areas related to the student teacher's rapport with students, the physical appearance of the classroom, the quality of special projects (e.g., bulletin boards), and classroom management issues. While all of these aspects of teaching are important, the cooperating teachers' comments provided little substantive feedback regarding the area of Instruction (e.g., use of varied teaching methods, pacing instructional activities properly). More substantive commentary on the part of cooperating teachers (either verbal or written) is essential to improving student teachers' instructional practice.

Educational Significance

In reference to Glickman's two-part observation process, it appears that cooperating teachers are not trained sufficiently to describe what they see in the classroom. Hence, cooperating teachers have a difficult time interpreting the events of the classroom. When cooperating teachers have adequate information, making judgments about the quality of student teachers is an easier task. In the absence of well documented observations, cooperating teachers apparently find it difficult to discern growth in a student teacher as evidenced by the lack of significant differences between mid-term and final evaluations on five of the six scales.

If student teachers are to significantly improve during the student teaching experience, it is essential to provide for adequate training of cooperating teachers. This study identifies areas in which cooperating teachers need to improve their observation skills and suggestions are made to provide appropriate training of cooperating teachers in these areas. An interesting follow-up would be to determine why cooperating teachers provide only positive feedback. Is it that they don't know what to look for or are they reluctant to put negative feedback in writing? Are they avoiding the "bad guy" role? Do they mention negatives in verbal conferences? It is hoped that this study will lead to further investigation of these findings. We must find ways to improve the quality of cooperating

teacher/student teacher interaction so that beginning teachers of higher quality enter the profession.

References

Glickman, C. (1985). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Streifer, P. (1984). The validation of teaching competencies in Connecticut. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Streifer, P. & Iwanicki, E. (1987). The validation of beginning teacher competencies in Connecticut. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1(1), 33-56.

Table 1

Description of Sample by
Sex and Grade Level Taught
(n=25)

Grade Level Taught	Sex	
	Male	Female
K		1
1		3
2		3
3		5
4	2	
5	3	2
6	3	
8	2	
Senior High	1	
Total	11	14

Table 2

Percentage of Cooperating Teachers That Addressed Each Category at Least Once

Category	Percentage
Planning	64
Instruction	72
Professional Knowledge	16
Classroom Management	72
Personal Attributes	76
Professional Responsibilities	56

Table 3

Percentage and Number of All Competencies Addressed by Cooperating Teachers

Number of Competencies	Percentage	Cooperating Teachers
14	47	1
11	37	1
10	37	2
8	27	1
7	23	4
6	20	3
5	17	3
4	13	3
3	10	2
2	7	3
1	3	1
0	0	1

Table 4

Comparison of Mid-Term and Final Evaluation Ratings by Category

Category	Mid-Term Mean	Final Mean	t
Planning	3.70	4.23	-2.51 *
Instruction	3.70	4.04	-1.61
Professional Knowledge	3.71	4.12	-1.79
Classroom Management	3.75	4.14	-2.05
Personal Attributes	4.23	4.52	-1.78
Professional Responsibility	4.34	4.38	-0.12

* $p<.05$

Table 5

Comparison of Cooperating Teachers' Mid-term and Final Ratings and the Frequency of Narrative Comments

Item	Frequency of Narratives		Means		t
	Times Discussed	Number of Teachers	Mid-term	Final	
Planning					
2	8	6	3.75	4.50	-2.67 *
4	3	2	3.63	4.06	-2.15 *
Instruction					
8	13	12	3.44	4.00	-2.18 *
Professional Knowledge					
17	3	3	3.63	4.19	-2.18 *
Classroom Management					
20	15	12	3.75	4.31	-2.76 *
Personal Attributes					
24	8	6	4.19	4.69	-2.24 *

(*) $p<.05$

NOTE: All other items were not significantly different.

Appendix A

Teaching Competencies

PLANNING:

1. Establishes objectives that are clear.
2. Establishes objectives appropriate for the learners.
3. Prepares lesson plans that are complete.
4. Prepares lesson plans that are appropriate for the objectives.

INSTRUCTION:

5. Makes the objectives of the lesson clear to students.
6. Presents lessons that involve a variety of ... methods.
   ... materials.
   ... audio-visuals.
   ... human resources.
7. Provides clear directions and explanations when teaching.
8. Paces instructional activities appropriately.
9. Ties together planned and chance events of the lesson and relates them to the objectives.
10. Keeps students' attention.
11. Evaluates learners' progress appropriately.
12. Uses standard English in oral presentations.
13. Uses standard English in written presentations.

PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE:

14. Demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter taught including ... its major principles and concepts.
15. ... its purpose and value.
16. ... up-to-date factual information.
17. Demonstrates knowledge of various teaching styles and learning styles and understands their interrelationships.

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT:

18. Provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly.
19. Establishes and maintains classroom routines and procedures.
20. Handles discipline problems fairly and consistently.
21. Develops and maintains a system for keeping group and individual records.

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES:

22. Demonstrates enthusiasm and self-confidence in the classroom.
23. Demonstrates sensitivity and respect concerning the needs and feelings of students.
24. Communicates effectively with students.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY:

25. Follows the policies, procedures, and curricula of the school district.
26. Works cooperatively with ... colleagues.
27. ... administrators.
28. ... parents.
29. Demonstrates responsibility for self-growth and professional improvement.
30. Demonstrates responsibility for self-evaluation.

Appendix B

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT HARRISBURG - The Capital College
Education Programs Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Progress Report Form

Please check one: [ ] EDUC 313A [ ] EDUC 313B [ ] Student Teaching [ ] Other .....

Student Teacher ..... Date ..... District .....

Cooperating Teacher ..... Grade Level ..... Building .....

University Supervisor ..... Subject .....

For each category below, please indicate the number(s) of particular strengths (+) and/or weaknesses (-). Examples of the competencies that should be considered in each category are listed on the reverse side of this form. In addition, please describe the student's strengths and weaknesses in the space provided below. Additional comments may be attached if necessary.

_____ Planning _____ Instruction _____ Professional Knowledge

_____ Classroom Management _____ Professional Attributes _____ Professional Responsibility

Comments:

Evaluator's Signature .....

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT HARRISBURG - The Capital College
Education Program Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Student Teaching Evaluation Form

Student Teacher ..... Date ..... District .....

Cooperating Teacher ..... Grade Level ..... Building .....

University Supervisor ..... Subject .....

For each item, please circle the letter indicating the student's level of performance according to the following definitions.

O = OUTSTANDING: As good as I would expect from a fully certified teacher.
E = EXCELLENT: Much better than I would expect from a student at this stage of the teacher preparation program.
G = GOOD: Somewhat better than I would expect from a student at this stage of the student teaching experience.
S = SATISFACTORY: Meets my expectations for a student at this stage of the student teaching experience.
P = POOR: Not as good as I would expect for a student at this stage of the student teaching experience.
I = NOT OBSERVED: I had insufficient opportunity to observe.

1. Establishes objectives that are clear.	O	E	G	S	P	I
2. Establishes objectives appropriate for the learners.	O	E	G	S	P	I
3. Prepares lesson plans that are complete.	O	E	G	S	P	I
4. Prepares lesson plans that are appropriate for the objectives.	O	E	G	S	P	I
5. Makes the objectives of the lesson clear to students.	O	E	G	S	P	I
6. Presents lessons that involve a variety of ... methods.	O	E	G	S	P	I
... materials.	O	E	G	S	P	I
... advancing technologies.	O	E	G	S	P	I
... human resources.	O	E	G	S	P	I
7. Provides clear directions and explanations when teaching.	O	E	G	S	P	I
8. Paces instructional activities appropriately.	O	E	G	S	P	I
9. Ties together planned and chance events of the lesson and relates them to the objectives.	O	E	G	S	P	I
10. Keeps students' attention.	O	E	G	S	P	I
11. Evaluates learners' progress appropriately.	O	E	G	S	P	I
12. Uses standard English in oral presentations.	O	E	G	S	P	I
13. Uses standard English in written presentations.	O	E	G	S	P	I
14. Demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter taught, including...						
...its major principles and concepts.	O	E	G	S	P	I
...its purpose and value.	O	E	G	S	P	I
...up-to-date factual information.	O	E	G	S	P	I
15. Demonstrates knowledge of various teaching styles and learning styles and understands their interrelationships.	O	E	G	S	P	I
16. Develops and maintains a system for keeping group and individual records.	O	E	G	S	P	I
17. Provides a learning environment that is attractive and orderly.	O	E	G	S	P	I
18. Establishes and maintains classroom routines and procedures.	O	E	G	S	P	I
19. Handles discipline problems fairly and consistently.	O	E	G	S	P	I
20. Demonstrates enthusiasm and self-confidence in the classroom.	O	E	G	S	P	I
21. Demonstrates sensitivity and respect concerning the needs and feelings of students.	O	E	G	S	P	I
22. Communicates effectively with students.	O	E	G	S	P	I
23. Follows the policies, procedures, and curricula of the school district.	O	E	G	S	P	I
24. Works cooperatively with ... colleagues.	O	E	G	S	P	I
... administrators.	O	E	G	S	P	I
... parents.	O	E	G	S	P	I
25. Demonstrates responsibility for self-growth and professional improvement.	O	E	G	S	P	I
26. Demonstrates responsibility for self-evaluation.	O	E	G	S	P	I

Please provide, on the reverse side of this sheet, additional information about the student teacher's specific strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate.

Cooperating Teacher's Signature ..... (787)